

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1-4. These sheets, which include Figs. 1-4, replace the original sheets including Figs. 1-4.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19 and 25-37 are pending, with Claims 1-7, 13-19 and 26-37 amended and Claims 20-24 cancelled by the present amendment.

In the Official Action, Claim 25 was objected to; the title was objected to; the Figures were objected to; Claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 26 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101; Claims 1-24 and 26-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claims 1, 4-7, 10-13, 16-19, 22-26, 29-32 and 35-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chakrabarti (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,899); and Claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 14, 15, 20, 21, 27, 28, 33, and 34 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the personal interview between the Examiner and Applicants' representative on July 27, 2006. During the interview, all objections and rejections were discussed. The Examiner acknowledged that most, if not all, objections and rejections would be overcome with minor edits to Applicants' proposed amendment. In particular, the Examiner acknowledged that Applicants' explanation and amendment overcame the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, regarding 'uncoupled' and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) in view of Chakrabarti. The Examiner reported that further consultation with her supervisor was required regarding whether the amendments discussed overcame the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101.

The amendment discussed during the interview is reproduced herewith, albeit edited as discussed during the interview. No new matter is added.

Applicants traverse the objection to the title as the title accurately describes the invention and because thirteen words is not lengthy.

Figures 1-4 are labeled as “Background Art” as requested in the Official Action.

Applicants traverse the objection to Claim 25 and note that Claim 25 is a proper multiple dependent claim per 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c).

Claims 1-7, 13-19 and 26-37 are amended to overcome the outstanding objection and rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112. No new matter is added. Details follow.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, cited on page 5 of the Official Action and submit that the originally recited ‘ranking the relevance of a node in a linked set of nodes’ is the tangible result of the method or system recited in the claims. A ranking of relevance is used, for example, to search, navigate and retrieve objects from an electronic archive.

Applicants have amended all pending claims which originally recited the terms ‘authority-like’ and ‘hub-like’ terms to recite ‘authority’ and ‘hub’, respectively. Thus, the rejection of Claims 1-3, 7, 13-15, 19 26-28 and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, of page 5 of the Official Action is moot.

Claims 4-6, 16-18, 29-32, and 35-37 are amended to overcome the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, cited on pages 5 and 6 of the Official Action.

Claims 2-3, 14-15, 27-28 and 33-34 are amended to overcome the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, cited on pages 5 and 6 of the Official Action.

Claims 2-3, 8-9, 14-15, 27-28, and 33-34 are amended to more clearly describe Applicants’ invention. No new matter is added.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 8-10 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, cited on page 5 of the Official Action and submit the preamble of Claims

8-10 and 20-22 establish antecedent basis support to Claims 7 and 19, respectively.

Furthermore, Claims 20-22 are cancelled, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Applicants traverse the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, of Claims 1, 17, 19 and 26 cited on page 6 of the Official Action regarding the term ‘mathematically decoupled.’ However, to advance prosecution, Claims 1, 17, 19 and 26 are amended to clarify that the step of determining an authority weight is performed independently from the step of determining a hub weight, and vice versa. Applicants submit that one skilled in the art would understand the term ‘decoupled’ in view of the art in general and in view of Applicants’ originally filed specification.¹

Briefly recapitulating, amended Claim 1 is directed to a computer-implemented method of searching, navigating or retrieving one or more information objects in one or more electronic archives and including ranking the relevance of a node in a linked set of nodes. The method includes determining an authority weight for said node using a non-compound, non-normalized Forward operator and without using a Backward operator; determining a hub weight for said node using a non-compound, non-normalized Backward operator and without using a Forward operator such that said steps of determining are mathematically decoupled; and ranking said relevance based upon said authority weight and said hub weight. Applicants claimed method provides for improved searching, navigating and ranking of information objects. Claims 7 and 26 are directed to a device and system corresponding to the method of Claim 1. Claims 13 and 32 are directed to a method and system where at least one of the previously described determining steps is performed.

Chakrabarti describes a method for identifying, filtering, ranking and cataloging information elements; as for example, World Wide Web pages, of the Internet in whole, part, or in combination. The method is preferably implemented in computer software and features

¹ Specification, paragraphs 0048, 0051, 0055, 0073, 0076, and 0084.

steps for enabling a user to interactively create an information database including preferred information elements such as preferred World Wide Web pages in whole, part, or in combination. The method includes steps for enabling a user to interactively create a frame-based, hierarchical organizational structure for the information elements, and steps for identifying and automatically filtering and ranking by relevance, information elements, such as World Wide Web pages for populating the structure, to form; for example, a searchable, World Wide Web page database. Additionally, the method features steps for enabling a user to interactively define a frame-based, hierarchical information structure for cataloging information, identifying a preliminary population of information elements for a particular hierarchical category arranged as a frame, based upon the respective frame attributes, and thereafter, expanding the information population to include related information, and subsequently, automatically filtering and ranking the information based upon relevance, and then populating the hierarchical structure with the a definable portion of the filtered, ranked information elements.²

However, contrary to the Official Action, Chakrabarti does not disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed steps of determining that are mathematically decoupled. Indeed, Chakrabarti is an example of Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (see discussion in the specification re: Kleinberg and HITS). As with Kleinberg and HITS, Chakrabarti relies upon *coupled* operations. In column 19, lines 34-52, Chakrabarti describes that the authority scores a is related to the h vector, and that the hub scores h is related to the a vector. Because of this mutual interdependence the authority and hub scores a and h are mathematically related to each other. Because the scores are mathematically related to each other, these two scores are coupled (i.e., *not decoupled*). Thus, Chakrabarti does not disclose or suggest the processes of Claims 1, 7 and 26. Chakrabarti also does not disclose or suggest the processes

² Chakrabarti, abstract.

recited in Claims 13 and 32, due to the fact that the inherent mutual interdependence of the manner that the Chakrabarti process determines the authority scores a and the hub scores h.

MPEP § 2131 notes that “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). See also MPEP § 2131.02. “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Because Chakrabarti does not disclose or suggest all the features recited in Claims 1, 7, 13, 26, and 32, Chakrabarti does not anticipate the invention recited in Claims 1, 7, 13, 26, and 32, and all claims depending therefrom.

Accordingly, in view of the present amendment and in light of the previous discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request an early and favorable action to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Michael E. Monaco
Registration No. 52,041